

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the above application in view of the following amendments and remarks. In the Office Action mailed on March 27, 2006, the examiner has rejected claims 1-9. In response to the above Office Action, claims 1-9 have been canceled without prejudice, and new claims 10-25 have been introduced. Following entry of these amendments, claims 10-25 will be pending in the application. No new subject matter is introduced.

10 Claim Rejections under U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the prior Office Action, the Examiner had rejected claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Reddy et al.* (US 5,847,617).

Applicant has canceled claims 1-9 without prejudice, as the Examiner's anticipated rejection are moot in view of new claims introduced.

15

New Claims

Applicant has introduced new claims 10-25. Applicant asserts that the new claims should be placed in a condition of allowance according to the following reasons:

20 Claims 10 and 18:

The new independent claims 10 and 18 include the limitation "a first detector receiving an input signal and an output oscillating clock, detecting a phase difference between the input signal and the output oscillating clock" and "a second detector for outputting a detecting signal according to the reference clock and a predetermined frequency". No new matter is entered through these amendments.

25 Because *Reddy et al.* do not teach or suggest the clock generator, including a first detector and a second detector, applicant asserts that new claims 10 and 18 should be found allowable with respect to the teachings of *Reddy et al.* Also, as claims 11-17 and 19-25 are dependent upon claims 10 and 18, if independent claims 10 and 18 are found allowable, so should dependent claims 11-17 and 19-25. Consideration of new claims 10 and 18, and dependent claims 11-17 and 19-25 is respectfully requested.

Claims 11 and 19:

New claims 11 and 19 include limitations for "the multiplexer, the second detector, and the controller form a first loop".

Because *Reddy et al* do not teach or suggest a multiplexer, a second detector,
5 or a controller form a first loop, applicant asserts that new claims 11 and 19 should be found allowable with respect to the teachings of *Reddy et al*.

Claims 12 and 20:

New claims 12 and 20 include the limitation "the first loop is located in the
10 VCO".


Because *Reddy et al* do not teach or suggest a first loop being located in the VCO, applicant asserts that new claims 12 and 20 should be found allowable with respect to the teachings of *Reddy et al*.

15 For at least these reasons, applicant asserts that claims 10-25 should be place in condition for allowance with respect to *Reddy et al*.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

20

Sincerely yours,



Date: June 27, 2006

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

25 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

30 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)